

## PATENT

## REMARKS

An editorial change has been made in the specification with no new matter involved.

Claim 1-12 and 14-27 are pending in the present application. In the aforementioned Office Action, all claims were rejected. By this response, applicants respectfully resubmit the pending claims for the Examiner's reconsideration for reasons stated below.

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 19, 22, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mallory* (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,933) in view of *Campana, Jr.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,446,759). In the rejection, the Examiner based on *Mallory* which teaches a single signal source with a plurality of frames, and conceded that *Mollory* does not teach combining a plurality of received transmissions from a plurality of respective signal sources to recover a message. Nevertheless, the Examiner referred to *Campana, Jr.* and alleged that *Campana, Jr.* teaches what *Mallory* lacks.

Applicants respectfully submit that the reference of *Campana, Jr.* is misconstrued and thereby inappropriately applied to Applicants' claims.

Applicants specifically claim, for example, in claim 1, that to recover messages, among other things, by substituting "good frames" from one received transmission "for the erased frames" from another received transmission. "[E]ach of the plurality of received transmissions" is further recited in claim 1 as "from the plurality of respective signal sources."

The multiple sources 124 in Fig. 11 of *Campana, Jr.* is not for a receiver to recover messages by substituting good frames from one received transmission of one signal source for the erased frames from another received transmission of another signal source. Instead, in *Campana, Jr.* the multiple sources are installed for a different purpose. More specifically, the multiple sources 124 are implemented for adequate communication coverage of a geographic area (column 57, lines 18-26 of *Campana, Jr.*). In *Campana, Jr.*, a message is doubly

**PATENT**

transmitted but delayed by a time delay interval (Fig. 8 and the relevant description of *Campana, Jr.*) However, the doubly transmitted message is transmitted not from a plurality of signal sources but rather from one source (Figs. 7A and 7B of *Campana, Jr.* and the relevant description). Since each message is segmented, duplicated, and interleaved, each of the duplicated segment is separated by a time delay within the same message and then transmitted out of the same signal source. Repair of defective data segment is replacement of the delayed counterpart out of the same message from the same signal source (Fig. 33 and the relevant description of *Campana, Jr.*). Phrase differently, each receiver 104 is intended to receive a transmission from a single signal source 124. Reception of signal transmissions by the receiver 104 from multiple sources 124 can be possible but can be regarded as merely incidental.

Nowhere in *Mallory* or *Campana, Jr.* is there any explicit or implied teaching that good frames from a received transmission of one signal source can be used to substitute defective frames from another received transmission of another signal source, as claimed by Applicants. In *Mallory*, the frame retransmission process involves a single sender and a single receiver (e.g., see column 2, line 62 to column 3, line 10 of *Mallory*). In *Campana, Jr.*, as mentioned above and throughout *Campana, Jr.*, all messages are partitioned, interwoven, and doubly sent out of a single signal source. Accordingly, the two references *Mallory* and *Campana, Jr.*, even if strainedly combined, still do not meet Applicants' claim 1.

Along the same line of reasoning, independent claims 19, 26 and 27 are corresponding apparatus claims and are submitted to be patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is submitted to be patentable. As for claims 3, 6-8, 20, 22 are dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable by virtual of their dependence on their respective independent claims 1 and 19.

In the aforementioned Office Action, claims 2, 9-12, 14-17, 21, 24 and 25 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mallory* and *Campana, Jr.* in view of Keskitalo (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,553). Furthermore, claims 4, 5, 18 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mallory* and *Campana, Jr.* in view of Alanara (U.S. Patent No. 6,286,122).

**PATENT**

The aforementioned rejected claims are collectively discussed below.

With respect to claims 2, 4, 5, 9-12 and 14-17, 21, 23 24 and 25 they are dependent claims dependent directly or indirectly on their respective independent claims 1 and 19. Independent claims 1 and 19 are submitted to be patentable as set forth above. Each of claims 2, 9-12, 14-17, 21, 24 and 25 includes one or more limitations on the top of their independent claims, is submitted to be, *a fortiori*, over the prior art.

Claim 18 is an independent claim also submitted to be distinguishable over the prior art. That is, there is neither explicit nor implied suggestions found in the prior art, including *Alanara*, that good frames from one received transmission of one signal source can be used to substitute defective frames from another received transmission of another signal source, as claimed in claim 18.

In light of the above amendment and remarks, all claims remaining in the application, i.e., claims 1-12 and 14-27 are submitted to be patentable over the prior art. Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

**PATENT**

In the event of any fees that may be due or any overpayments that may be associated with this response, please charge or deposit the amount to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 29, 2005

By: 

Kam T. Tam, Reg. No. 35,756  
(858) 651-5563

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502